

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed March 3, 2009. Claims 1-4, 7, 9-15, 19-34, 37, 39-45, and 59-83 were pending in the present application. Claims 19, 39 and 49 are objected to due to informalities which have been corrected by the present amendments to the claims.

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-15, 19-21, 31-34, 37, 39-51, 61-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Jasinski* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: 2002/0164151) in view of *Narayanaswami et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: 2003/0011684) (hereinafter "*Narayanaswami*") and further in view of *Boegelund et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: 2003/0101043) (hereinafter "*Boegelund*"). Claims 22-29, 52-59 and 78-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jasinski*, in view of *Narayanaswami* and further *Boegelund* and further in view of *Lin* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: 2004/0205477) (hereinafter "*Lin*").

This Amendment amends claims 1, 12, 31, 42, 61 and 69, without adding or canceling any claims, leaving pending in the application claims 1-4, 7, 9-15, 19-34, 37, 39-45 and 49-83. In light of the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

A telephonic interview was conducted with Examiner Myint and the undersigned on June 26<sup>th</sup>, 2009. The discussion was generally directed towards the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants sincerely thank the Examiner for his consideration of the arguments presented and his suggestions to help move prosecution of the Application forward. Amendments made with the Examiner's suggestions in mind are reflected in the listing of claims above.

#### **I. Claim Objections**

Claims 19, 39 and 49 are objected because they depend from previously canceled claims. Claims 19, 39 and 49 have been amended to depend from pending claims 12, 37 and 45, respectively. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 19, 39 and 49 be withdrawn.

## **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-15, 19-21, 31-34, 37, 39-51 and 61-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jasinski* in view of *Narayanaswami* and further in view of *Boegelund*. Claims 22-29, 52-59 and 78-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jasinski*, in view of *Narayanaswami* and further and *Boegelund* and further in view of *Lin*. These rejections are traversed.

### **A. Independent Claims 1, 12, 31, 42, 61 and 69**

Obviousness is not established in regards to currently amended independent claims 1, 12, 31, 42, 61 and 69 because *Jasinski*, *Narayanaswami* and *Boegelund*, alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 12, 31, 42, 61 and 69. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, independent claims 1, 12, 31 and 42 have been amended to recite, “whereby the (at least one) device is operable to display the translated version of the source document while accessing (the portion of) the accessed recorded information.” *Jasinski*, *Narayanaswami* and *Boegelund* do not teach or suggest such a feature.

Similarly, independent claims 61 and 69 have been amended to recite, “code for communicating translated information to a device when the criterion is satisfied, the translated information including a translation of at least a portion of the source information, whereby the device is operable to display the translated information while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information.” *Jasinski*, *Narayanaswami* and *Boegelund* also do not teach or suggest such a feature.

Since *Jasinski*, *Narayanaswami* and *Boegelund* do not teach or suggest each and every element of the currently amended independent claims 1, 12, 31, 42, 61 and 69, obviousness is not established. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Jasinski*, *Narayanaswami* and *Boegelund* be withdrawn and independent claims 1, 12, 31, 42, 61 and 69 be allowed.

**B. Dependent Claims 2-4, 7, 9-11, 13-15, 19-21, 32-34, 37, 39-41, 43-51, 62-68 and 70-77**

Dependent claims 2-4, 7, 9-11, 13-15, 19-21, 32-34, 37, 39-41, 43-51, 62-68 and 70-77 are allowable by virtue of depending from allowable subject matter discussed above and include additional patentable subject matter. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under §103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

**C. Independent Claims 22, 52 and 78**

The Office Action alleges that,

[I]t would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of displaying a slide while accessing the portion of the accessed rerecorded information [of *Lin*] to the method of *Jasinski* in view of *Nranyanaswami* in view of *Boegelund* so that the resultant method would display translated slides while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information. One would have been motivated to do so in order to produce a replayable recording of the real-time presentation. (*Lin*, paragraph 0006).

However, as the rejection stands, the rejection inherently implies that it requires combining the disclosures of no fewer than four separate references to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 22, 52 and 78. The fact that no fewer than four references are cited implies that it would not have been obvious to combine them. Additionally, the fact the cited references are from disparate fields implies that it would not have been obvious to look to the four cited references to arrive at claims 22, 52 and 78.

For example, *Lin* is directed to a system for recording a presentation while *Naranyanaswami* is directed to an image capture system and method for automatically watermarking recorded parameters for providing digital image verification. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no logical reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would look to a system and method for watermarking recorded parameters for verification purposes to combine with a method for recording a presentation. Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine such disclosures.

For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 22, 52 and 78 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

**D. Dependent claims**

Dependent claims 23-29, 53-59 and 79-82 are allowable by virtue of depending from allowable subject matter discussed above and include additional patentable subject matter. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under §103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,



Marc R. Knittel  
Reg. No. 55,333

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
JDL:atm  
61893077 v1